

REMARKS

Claims 1-16 and 18-33 are now pending in the application. Claims 1-33 stand rejected. Claims 1, 15, 18 and 27 have been amended herein. In the interest of expediting prosecution, Claim 15 has been amended to include the features of Claim 17 and Claim 17 has been cancelled herein. Support for the amendments can be found throughout the application, drawings and claims as originally filed and, as such, no new matter has been presented. The Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw the rejections in view of the amendments and remarks contained therein.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 112

Claims 1-14 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being incomplete for omitting essential elements, such omission amounting to a gap between the elements. Claims 27-33 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being incomplete for omitting essential steps, such omission amounting to a gap between the steps. Applicant has amended Claims 1 and 27 to overcome these rejections. Therefore, reconsideration and withdrawal of these rejections are respectfully requested.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1-33 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Milden (U.S. Pat. No. 5,421,728; hereinafter "Milden"). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Initially, Applicant notes that Milden appears to disclose a system for supplying simulated data for use in-flight. The simulated data can be loaded prior to the take-off of the aircraft and can include mission data that comprises simulated threat scenarios

and data for creating threat scenarios. The simulated data can be used during the in-flight operation of the aircraft if desired. In contrast, independent Claim 1 has been amended to recite:

at least one simulator that simulates an asset to enable a user to train to use the asset; and
a bridge coupled between the at least one simulator and the transceiver that facilitates the training and transmits the real asset data to the simulator, with the simulator using the real asset data to simulate the asset to train the user.

In addition, independent Claim 15 has been amended to recite:

when executed, the computer readable medium computes an equation for a curve to fit real asset data received by the bridge, interpolates the real asset data based on the computed curve, and repeats the computing and interpolating steps until no new real asset data is received by the bridge such that a plurality of curves representing the motion of the real asset are created.

Independent Claim 27 recites:

...(2) computing an equation for a curve to fit the real asset data received;
(3) interpolating real asset data based on the computed equation to create a curve; ...
(5) transmitting the motion of the real asset to the simulated environment.

In view of the above discussion, Applicant asserts that Milden does not teach, suggest or disclose whatsoever each and every element of Claims 1, 15 and 27. In this regard, Milden does not teach, suggest or disclose a bridge that transmits real asset data to a simulator, with the simulator using the real asset data to simulate the asset to train the user, computing an equation for a curve to fit the real asset data or interpolating the real asset data based on the computed equation to create a curve. Further, it would be improper to modify Milden to include using a simulator for training,

computing an equation for a curve or interpolating the real asset data based on the computed equation as Milden does not teach or suggest this feature whatsoever.

Accordingly, as Milden does not teach, suggest or disclose each and every element in independent Claims 1, 15 and 27, Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner reconsider and withdraw the rejection of Claims 1, 15 and 27 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b).

With regard to Claims 2-14, 16, 18-26 and 28-33, Applicant notes these claims depend either directly or indirectly from independent Claims 1, 15 and 27, and, thus, these claims should be in condition for allowance for the reasons set forth for Claims 1, 15 and 27 above. Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw the rejection of Claims 2-14, 16, 18-26 and 28-33 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b).


CONCLUSION

It is believed that all of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicant therefore respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw all presently outstanding rejections. It is believed that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office Action and the present application is in condition for allowance. Thus, prompt and favorable consideration of this amendment is respectfully requested. If the Examiner

believes that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at (248) 641-1600.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: 10/23/06

By: 
Mark D. Elchuk, Reg. No. 33,686
Erica K. Schaefer, Reg. No. 55,861

HARNESS, DICKEY & PIERCE, P.L.C.
P.O. Box 828
Bloomfield Hills, Michigan 48303
(248) 641-1600

MDE/EKS/chs

G:\eschaefer\7784\000900-999\000932\932Amendment\932Amendment Due 10-21-2006.doc